HARVARD LAW REVIEW.

Published monthly, during the Academic Year, by Harvard Law Students.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.50 PER ANNUM. . . . . 35 CENTS PER NUMBER.

JUDICIAL LEGISLATION. — *Trustees* v. *Jennings*, 18 S. E. (S. C.) 257, is a curious case. In *Trustees* v. *McCully*, 11 Rich. Law, 424 (1858), the South Carolina court held that evidence of adverse possession of land for twenty years would justify the jury in presuming a good title by lost deed; and this in the face of a statute of 1805, which perpetually exempted the land in question from the operation of the statute of limitations. The court in 1858 therefore practically re-enacted the statute which the Legislature in 1805 had specifically repealed. In the principal case, the right to disregard the presumption, left to the jury by *Trustees* v. *McCully*, is finally denied, and it is substantially held that the only facts admissible to rebut the presumption are those which would go to disprove adverse possession. The last distinction is gone between the statute of limitations, repealed by the Legislature, and the presumption enacted in its place by the court. "Although the statute . . . could not be pleaded in bar," say the latter, "yet . . . the Legislature did not interdict the defence of the presumption."

RIGHT TO PRIVACY AGAIN. — *Marks* v. *Jaffa* (N. Y. Law Jour., Jan. 6, 1894), like other cases of its kind, furnishes in the action of the defendant most satisfactory evidence of the justice of the rule of law which gives men "the right to be let alone." The defendant, editor of a newspaper called "Der Wachter," started to publish portraits of the plaintiff, once an actor, now a law student, and of an actor called "Mogulesko," and invited his readers to give by vote their opinions as to which of the two was the more popular. Now it is a perversion of the law of truth in libel to say that it applies to such a case. It is not a case of libel but of invasion of privacy, of unwarrantable and impertinent disregard for the feelings of a person who has in no way offered himself for such criticism. McAdam, J., granted the injunction applied for, saying that the plaintiff's right was "too clear . . . to require further discussion." It is pleasant